APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/558,433	02/12/2007	Seung-Myun Baek	7950.044.00	6700

30827   7590   04/17/2008
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER
EL-ZOOBI, MARIA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2614	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/17/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/558,433	BAEK ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MARIA EL-ZOOBI	2614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-74</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>30 May 2003</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☒ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2.   Claims 1-74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being

indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention.

For example, claim 1 recites the limitation "parameter units under the definition of

the message and a number unit of parameters" is not clear what <u>under the definition of</u>

<u>the message and a number unit of parameters</u> means, however, the specification does

not clarify this limitation, see Paragraph 0060; which is repeat the same claim language

without any further explanation. Also claim 1 recites the limitation <u>transmitted/received</u> is

not clear weather the "/" is to distinguish between the transmitting and receiving action.

Another example, claim 2 recites the limitation "logical address" is not clear what

does it mean by <u>logical</u>, however, the specification does clearly clarify this limitation, see

Paragraph 0058.

Claim 11, recite the limitation "basic communication" is not clear. What does a

<u>basic</u> communication message consist of?

Claims 4-11 are rejected for being depending on a rejected claim.

Another example, claim 12, recites "a dummy message", is indefinite and not

clear what is this <u>dummy signal</u> means.

Claim 8/1 recites the limitation "the first and second code region" is indefinite because , the refers that this limitation has been mentioned before, however, this limitation is not mentioned in the parent claim 1. Claim 1 does not recite any regions in any unit, therefore, Examiner will ignore claim8/1.

Claims 13-18 are rejected as being depending on a rejected claim.

Also claim 13, recites the limitation "a number unit of return arguments" is not clear what is a number unit? is it the name of the unit or is it a number of unit for the arguments?

Also claim 13 recites the limitation "an internet operation program code command" is not clear what this limitation means.

Claim 18 recites the limitation "a recognition code" is not clear what exactly this limitation means, what this code recognize?

Another example, claim 19 recites the limitation a type of 'recognition code=product ID code command' is indefinite and not clear whether the limitation between the quotation mark is a part of the limitation or just an example, also using the phrase type of makes the limitation indefinite, because it is not clear if the phrase after t type of, should be exactly the same or close to it or just a command that do the same features.

Another example, claims 20 and 34 recite the limitation a factor name and a factor value, it is not clear what this limitation means and what is factor refers to.

Claims 21, 23, 33, 35 and 37 are rejected for the same reason stats in claim 19.

Claim 22 recites the limitation "a return argument name" is not clear what is

argument name refer to.

Claims 24-32, 38 and 39 are rejected for being depending on rejected claims.

Claim 4 for example, recites the limitation "comprises a byte number of the factor

value" this limitation is not clear and seems to be a literal translation to English. Is it

mean that the factor value is a byte? or the number of byte in the factor value?

Claims 40-74 are rejected for the same reasons stated above.

Examiner will interpret the claims as best understood in the light of 112 second

issues mentioned above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by
another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent
granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the
applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section
351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States
only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2)
of such treaty in the English language.

4.   Claims 1-2, 4/1, 4/2, 6-7, 9, 11-12, 16, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as

being unpatentable by Moyer (US Publication 2002/0103898).

Regarding claim 1: Moyer discloses a home network system (Fig. 2-6; different

architectures for the home network) comprising:

a home master device (Fig. 3, el. 204; appliance controller also see Paragraph

0092 and 0099) connected to a plurality of home appliances (Fig. 3, el. 206, 202 and in

Fig. 6, el. 210, 212 also see Paragraph 0099) and

a remote control server connected to the home master device through a
first network (Fig. 3, el. 116; the server is resident in the gateway or in different
architecture as in Fig. 4, el. 108; the server is in the service provider; see Paragraph
0080, 0087 and 0099) for transmitting/receiving a message between a user terminal
and the home master device (Paragraph 0099 and 0093)

wherein the message transmitted/received between the home master
device and the remote control server (Paragraph 0101) comprises at least a product
code unit of the corresponding home appliance (Paragraph 0102; lamp), a message
code unit for notifying a transmission/reception direction of the message (Paragraph
0101, 0103 and 0104; so the message indicates where the message coming from and
where it is going), parameter units under the definition of the message (Paragraph
0108; command to turn the appliance ON) and a number unit of parameters (Paragraph
0186 or 0216; parameter that specify if the code is either action or query)

Regarding claim 2, Moyer disclose, the product code unit comprises a product ID
code (Paragraph 0102; product ID is lamp) and a logical address of the home appliance
(Paragraph 0094 and 0102).

Regarding claim 4/1, Moyer discloses, wherein the product code unit comprises
at least characters (paragraph 0102; lamp).

Regarding claim 4/2, Moyer discloses, wherein the product code unit comprises

at least characters (paragraph 0102; lamp).

Regarding claim 6, Moyer discloses, the message code unit comprises at
least one of a first code region for displaying a message from the home master device
to the remote control server, and a second code region for displaying a message from
the remote control server to the home master device (Fig.7 and Paragraph 01100127).

Regarding claim 7, Moyer discloses, wherein the first code region and the
Second code region do not overlap with each other (see Paragraph 1012-0108, 0110-
0118 and ; the message contain line "first region" to indicate where the message is
coming from and line "second region" where the message is going; wherein the first line
start with "from" and the other line start with "to" to prevent overlap).

Regarding claim 9, Moyer discloses, wherein the product code unit, the message
code unit, the parameter units and the number unit of the parameters are
distinguished by predetermined delimiters (see Paragraph 0102-0108 for example of
message 1).

Regarding claim 11, Moyer discloses, the message is a message for basic
Communication (Paragraph 0099).

Regarding claim 12, Moyer discloses, the basic communication comprises
at least one of login request and response, a dummy message, and logout request
and response (see Paragraph 0102-0108; a message for communication).

Regarding claim 16, Moyer discloses, the message is a message for monitoring

the home appliance (Paragraph 0028, 0051 and 0232; status of the appliance).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claims 3, 4/3, 10/1, 10/9 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Moyer (US Publication 2002/0103898).

Regarding claim 3, Moyer discloses, the product ID code and the logical address

of the product code unit are formed with a space between them (Paragraph 0102)

Moyer does not disclose that the product ID code and the logical address

of the product code unit are formed without an empty space

However, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art, at the

time the invention was made to modify Moyer message in order to have no space

between the product ID code and the logical address in order to minimize the size of the

message.

Regarding claim 4/3, Moyer discloses, wherein the product code unit comprises

at least characters (paragraph 0102; lamp).

Regarding claim 10/1, Moyer discloses, wherein the message comprises the product code unit, the message code unit, the number unit of the parameters, and the parameter units.

Moyer does not disclose that product code unit, the message code unit, the number unit of the parameters, and the parameter units sequentially.

However it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to modify the message in Moyer system in order to have the units in the same claimed sequence, so to the user will have the desired design choice that meets his/her needs and be easier for programming.

Regarding claim 10/9, Moyer discloses, wherein the message comprises the product code unit, the message code unit, the number unit of the parameters, and the parameter units.

Moyer does not disclose that product code unit, the message code unit, the number unit of the parameters, and the parameter units sequentially.

However it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to modify the message in Moyer system in order to have the units in the same claimed sequence, so to the user will have the desired design choice that meets his/her needs and be easier for programming.

Regarding claim 39, Moyer discloses, the message is sent from the user computer from an email address using SLP URL (Paragraph 0101-0102; which obviously will identify the user terminal/computer).

Regarding claim 40, see claim 1 analysis, regarding the limitation <u>storage medium for recording a message in a home network system</u>, Moyer discloses, a server that communicate with a user PC through a network to control a house appliance (see Fig. 6-7; both server and the computer obvious to have a memory "also see paragraph 0087).

Moyer does not explicitly teach that the memory for <u>recording a message in a home network system</u> .

However, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Moyer so to record the message in the memory as claimed in order to enable the user to keep a record of the message for future use.

7.　　　Claims 5, 8/6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moyer (US Publication 2002/0103898) in view of Kim (US Patent 7,062,531).

Regarding claim 5, Moyer discloses, the message code unit comprises character.

Moyer does not discloses, that the message code unit comprises numbers.

However, having a message code unit comprises a numbers will be obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art, because it is a design choice and a user can has the messages coded in any way that suit his/her preference.

However, Kim in similar art of endeavor discloses, controlling a number of home

appliances by generate home code message that a manger network will transfer to the

home appliances (Col. 4, lines 7-19).

Kim also discloses that the home code define different regions for define the

destination address (or the region where the desired appliance is located) to which the

message is transmitted to (Col. 5, lines 1-15).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art, at the time

the invention was made to modify Moyer with Kim teaching to have the code message

unit as numbers in order to satisfy the user designing choice and this way if the user

does not want any one to know where the appliance located, he/she can refer to it by

numbers.

Regarding claim 8/6, Moyer discloses first and second code regions (see claim 6

analysis).

Moyer does not discloses that the first and second region comprise numbers.

However, having the regions that indicate the direction of the messages

comprises a numbers will be obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art, because it is a

design choice and a user can has the messages coded in any way that suit his/her

preference.

However, Kim in similar art of endeavor discloses, controlling a number of home

appliances by generate home code message that a manger network will transfer to the

home appliances (Col. 4, lines 7-19).

Kim also discloses that the home code define different regions for define the

destination address (or the region where the desired appliance is located) to which the

message is transmitted to (Col. 5, lines 1-15).

 Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art, at the time

the invention was made to modify Moyer with Kim teaching to have the regions in

numbers in order to satisfy the user designing choice and this way if the user

does not want any one to know where the appliance located, he/she can refer to it by

numbers.

8.   Claims 13-14, 15/13, 15/14, 17-23, 24/22, 24/23, 25-26, 27/25, 27/26, 28/25,

28/26, 31-37, 38/36, 38/37   rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Moyer (US Publication 2002/0103898) in view of Ha (US Publication

2004/0243684).

        Regarding claim 13, Moyer discloses, parameter units (see claim 1 analysis)

Moyer also discloses, an internet operation program code command unit for identifying

the home appliance (Paragraph 0316; d= door), a command unit for the home appliance

(Paragraph 0324), return argument units (Paragraph 0325 and 0227).

        Moyer does not disclose that the mentioned units are in the parameter unit.

However, it is obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to modify Moyer to have the mentioned units in the parameter unit, because it is a

programmable choice of the user when he/she program the message for the system, in

order to choose the message's packet that would be more convenient for him/her.

        Moyer does not disclose a User ID unit or a number unit of return argument.

Ha in same art of endeavor discloses network control system for home appliances. A communication packet contains a user ID unit (Paragraph 0104-0105) and an argument unit and argument ARG having a variable number of bits (Paragraph 0056 and 0083).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Moyer message as suggested by Ha in order to have a user ID, so only the owner of the appliance can control them, also modify the message to include a number unit of return argument to enable the user to know how many appliance respond, which will increase the user convenience.

Regarding claim 14, Moyer in view of Ha discloses, each of the parameter units comprises the user ID code unit, the internet operation program code command unit, the command unit for the home appliance, the number unit of the return arguments, and the return argument units.

Moyer in view of Ha does not disclose to have the claimed sequence.

However, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to modify Moyer in view of Ha to have the parameter unites in the claimed sequence because it is a design choice so a user can has the messages coded in any way that suit his/her preference.

Regarding claim 15/13, Moyer in view of Ha discloses, the user ID code unit, the internet operation program code command unit, the command unit for the

home appliance, the number unit of the return arguments and the return argument units
are distinguished by predetermined delimiters (Moyer: message has the units
distinguished by a delimiters, see Paragraph 0142-0150).

Regarding claim 15/14, wherein the user ID code unit, the internet operation
program code command unit, the command unit for the home appliance, the number
unit of the return arguments and the return argument units are distinguished by
predetermined delimiters (Moyer: message has the units distinguished by a delimiters
see Paragraph 0142-0150).

Regarding claim 17, Moyer in view of Ha discloses, a user ID code unit (Ha:
Paragraph 0104-0105 and 0101), and that the user ID is being entered by the user.

Moyer in view of Ha does not explicitly disclose that the user ID comprises
characters.

However, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art, at the
time the invention was made to modify Moyer in view of Ha to have the user enter the
user ID as character , in order to enable the user to use his preference choice and make
it more convenient for the user since it is easier for a user to memorize a character for
ID than numbers.

Regarding claim 18, Moyer in view of Ha discloses, wherein the internet
operation program code command unit comprises a recognition code for an internet

operation program, a product ID code (Moyer: Paragraph 0131; d=lamp). Also Moyer in view of Ha discloses a command unit (Moyer: Paragraph 0166).

Moyer in view of Ha does not disclose that the command unit included in the internet operation program code command unit.

However, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to modify Moyer in view of Ha to include the command unit in the internet operation program code command unit because it is a design choice so a user can has the messages coded in any way that suit his/her preference so it will be easier for the user to deal with the system.

Regarding claim 19, Moyer in view of Ha discloses, the internet operation program code command unit has a type of 'recognition code=product ID code_command' (Moyer: Paragraph 0102 and 0108, also see claim 18 analysis).

Regarding claim 20, Moyer in view of Ha discloses, wherein the command unit for the home appliance comprises a factor name and a factor value of the command (Moyer: Paragraph 0108; command <turn>on).

Regarding claim 21, Moyer in view of Ha discloses, the command unit for the Home appliance has a type of 'factor name=factor value' (Moyer: Paragraph 0108).

Regarding claim 22, Moyer in view of Ha discloses, each of the return argument

Units comprises a return argument name and a factor value (Moyer: Paragraph 0227).

regarding claim 23, Moyer in view of Ha discloses, each of the return argument Units has a type of 'name=factor value' (Moyer: Paragraph 0227).

Regarding claim 24/22, Moyer in view of Ha discloses that the event code is presented in 1 byte (Ha: Paragraph 0110 and 0112) and that the argument unit has a variable number of bits (Ha: Paragraph 0056) a and the number of bits in the argument units is determined in the command code (Ha: Paragraph 0083).

Regarding claim 24/23, Moyer in view of Ha discloses that the event code is presented in 1 byte (Ha: Paragraph 0110 and 0112) and that the argument unit has a variable number of bits (Ha: Paragraph 0056) a and the number of bits in the argument units is determined in the command code (Ha: Paragraph 0083).

Regarding claim 25, Moyer discloses, the parameter units comprises a command unit for the home appliance (Paragraph 0217 and 0185).

Moyer discloses an argument unit in the message (Paragraph 0227 and 0325), an internet operation program code command unit for identifying the home appliance (Paragraph 0316; d= door), a command unit for the home appliance (Paragraph 0324), each message include header that contain a track the IP address, also the communication from user to the server and then to the controller is a SIP

communication based (Paragraph 0054 and 0099; that means the message obviously

will have the IP of the controller/master device).

Moyer does not disclose that the mentioned units are in the parameter unit.

However, it is obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to modify Moyer to have the mentioned units in the parameter unit, because it is a

programmable choice of the user when he/she program the message for the system, in

order to choose the message's packet that would be more convenient for him/her.

Moyer does not disclose a User ID unit or a number unit of return argument.

Ha in same art of endeavor discloses network control system for home

appliances. A communication packet contains a user ID unit (Paragraph 0104-0105)

and an argument unit and argument ARG having a variable number of bits (Paragraph

0056 and 0083).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to modify Moyer message as suggested by Ha in order to

have a user ID, so only the owner of the appliance can control them, also modify the

message to include a number unit of return argument to enable the user to know how

many appliance respond, which will increase the user convenience.

Regarding claim 26, Moyer in view of Ha discloses, the parameter units

sequentially comprises the user ID code unit, the destination IP unit, the internet

operation program code command unit, the command unit for the home appliance,

the number unit of the arguments, and the argument units (see claim 25 analysis)

However, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to modify Moyer in view of Ha to have the parameter unites in the claimed sequence because it is a design choice so a user can has the messages coded in any way that suit his/her preference.

Regarding claim 27/25, Moyer in view of Ha discloses, the user ID code unit, the destination IP unit, the internet operation program code command unit, the command unit for the home appliance, the number unit of the arguments and the 5 argument units (see claim 25 analysis) are distinguished by predetermined delimiters (Moyer has the content of each unit of the message distinguished by a delimiters see Paragraph 0166, so when the parameter unit includes the claimed units as discussed in claim 25; these units will be distinguished with the same delimiters ">").

Regarding claim 27/26, Moyer in view of Ha discloses, the user ID code unit, the destination IP unit, the internet operation program code command unit, the command unit for the home appliance, the number unit of the arguments and the 5 argument units (see claim 25 analysis) are distinguished by predetermined delimiters (Moyer has the content of each unit of the message distinguished by a delimiters see Paragraph 0166, so when the parameter unit includes the claimed units as discussed in claim 25; these units will be distinguished with the same delimiters ">").

Regarding claim 28/25, Moyer in view of Ha discloses, the message is a control message for the home appliance (Moyer: Paragraph 0051).

Regarding claim 28/26, Moyer in view of Ha discloses, the message is a control message for the home appliance (Moyer: Paragraph 0051).

Regarding claim 31, Moyer in view of Ha discloses, user ID code (Ha: Paragraph 0104-0105 and 0101), and that the user ID is being entered by the user.

Moyer in view of Ha does not explicitly disclose that the user ID comprises characters.

However, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to modify Moyer in view of Ha to have the user enter the user ID as character , in order to enable the user to use his preference choice and make it more convenient for the user since it is easier for a user to memorize a character for ID than numbers.

Regarding claim 32, Moyer in view of Ha discloses, wherein the internet operation program code command unit comprises a recognition code for an internet operation program, a product ID code (Moyer: Paragraph 0131; d=lamp). Also Moyer in view of Ha discloses a command unit (Moyer: Paragraph 0166).

Moyer in view of Ha does not disclose that the command unit included in the internet operation program code command unit.

However, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to modify Moyer in view of Ha to include the command unit

in the internet operation program code command unit because it is a design choice so a user can has the messages coded in any way that suit his/her preference so it will be easier for the user to deal with the system.

Regarding claim 33, Moyer in view of ha discloses, the internet operation program code command unit has a type of 'recognition code=product ID code_command' (Moyer: Paragraph 0102 and 0108, also see claim 18 analysis).

Regarding claim 34, Moyer in view of Ha discloses, wherein the command unit for the home appliance comprises a factor name and a factor value of the command (Moyer: Paragraph 0108; command <turn>on).

Regarding claim 35, Moyer in view of Ha discloses, the command unit for the Home appliance has a type of 'factor name=factor value' (Moyer: Paragraph 0108).

Regarding claim 36, Moyer in view of Ha discloses, each of the return argument Units comprises a return argument name and a factor value (Moyer: Paragraph 0227).

Regarding claim 37, Moyer in view of Ha discloses, each of the return argument Units has a type of 'name=factor value' (Moyer: Paragraph 0227).

Regarding claim 38/36, Moyer in view of Ha discloses that the event code is presented in 1 byte (Ha: Paragraph 0110 and 0112) and that the argument unit has a variable number of bits (Ha: Paragraph 0056) a and the number of bits in the argument units is determined in the command code (Ha: Paragraph 0083).

Regarding claim 38/37, Moyer in view of Ha discloses that the event code is

presented in 1 byte (Ha: Paragraph 0110 and 0112) and that the argument unit has a

variable number of bits (Ha: Paragraph 0056) a and the number of bits in the argument

units is determined in the command code (Ha: Paragraph 0083).

9.   Claims 29/25 and 29/26, 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over unpatentable over Moyer (US Publication 2002/0103898) in view of

Ha (US Publication 2004/0243684) and further in view of Yamada et al (US Patent

6,415,313).

Regarding claim 29/25, Moyer in view of Ha discloses parameter units (see claim

25 analysis).

Moyer in view of Ha does not disclose a language unit for displaying a kind of a

language.

Yamada discloses, a message packet in a communication system (see Fig. 5)

the server control table will check the language of the message (see Fig. 10, el. 54)

where the language included in the header (Col. 5, lines 8-13).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art, at the

time the invention was made to modify Moyer in view of Ha to include a unit that display

the language as suggested by Yamada in order to give the user the ability to use

different language.

Regarding claim 29/26, Moyer in view of Ha discloses parameter units (see claim

25 analysis).

Moyer in view of Ha does not disclose a language unit for displaying a kind of a language.

Yamada discloses, a message packet in a communication system (see Fig. 5) the server control table will check the language of the message (see Fig. 10, el. 54) where the language included in the header (Col. 5, lines 8-13).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to modify Moyer in view of Ha to include a unit that display the language as suggested by Yamada in order to give the user the ability to use different language.

Regarding claim 30, Moyer in view of Ha and further in view of Yamada discloses, language unit (see claim 29 analysis).

Moyer in view of Ha and further in view of Yamada does not disclose wherein the language unit is included between the destination IP unit and the internet operation program code command unit.

However it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to modify Moyer in view of Ha and further in view of Yamada to have the language unit between the destination IP unit and the internet operation program code command unit (because: it is a design and programmable choice also having this unit between these two mentioned unit or anywhere in the parameter unit will not make a difference in the function of this unit) in order to enable

the user to design the desired packet of the message.

Regarding claims 42-74, please see the rejection as stated in claims 2-39.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MARIA EL-ZOOBI whose telephone number is (571)270-3434. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8AM-5 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on 571-272-7547. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Fan Tsang/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2614

/M. E./
Examiner, Art Unit 2614
/Maria El zoobi/
Examiner, Art Unit 2614